

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/514,513 02/28/00 CHAPPELL J 07678/011003

HM12/0611

EXAMINER

Paul T Clark
Clark & Elbing LLP
176 Federal Street
Boston MA 02110

NELSON, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1638

DATE MAILED:

06/11/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/514,513	CHAPPELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Amy Nelson	1638

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 1638

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The Drawings filed 2/28/00 have been approved by the Draftsperson.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not describe the claimed invention. The claimed invention is directed to plant cells and plants, not to polypeptides. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Specifically, the title should recite that the invention is directed to plant cells and plants, not to polypeptides.
4. This application is informal in the arrangement of the specification. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout and content for patent applications. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

The following order or arrangement is preferred in framing the specification and, except for the reference to "Microfiche Appendix" and the drawings, each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as section headings. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) Title of the Invention.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research or Development.
- (d) Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix" (see 37 CFR 1.96).

Art Unit: 1638

- (e) Background of the Invention.
 - 1. Field of the Invention.
 - 2. Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) Summary of the Invention.
- (g) Brief Description of the Drawing(s).
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention.
- (i) Claim or Claims (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) Drawings.
- (l) Sequence Listing (see 37 CFR 1.821-1.825).

In particular, the subheading "Brief Description of the Drawings" should be inserted, and the subheading "Detailed Description of the Invention" should be deleted from its present location and reinserted after the "Brief Description of the Drawings" section.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-12 of U.S. Patent No. 5,824,774. Although the

Art Unit: 1638

conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the plant cells and plants comprising a nucleic acid molecule encoding a chimeric isoprenoid synthase polypeptide of the instant invention are obvious in view of the claims to DNA encoding a chimeric isoprenoid synthase polypeptide, and cells comprising the DNA of the issued patent. It would have been obvious to transform plant cells, in particular, because the claimed DNAs are from plants (Claim 5). It further would have been obvious to regenerate transgenic plants from the transformed plant cells, in view of the knowledge of plant transformation and regeneration methods in the art.

7. Claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,072,045. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the plant cells and plants comprising a nucleic acid molecule encoding a chimeric isoprenoid synthase polypeptide of the instant invention are obvious in view of the claims to a nucleic acid molecule encoding a chimeric isoprenoid synthase polypeptide, and cells comprising the nucleic acid molecule of the issued patent. It would have been obvious to transform plant cells, instead of bacterial or yeast cells, because the disclosed nucleic acid molecules are from plants. It further would have been obvious to regenerate transgenic plants from the transformed plant cells, in view of the knowledge of plant transformation and regeneration methods in the art.

Art Unit: 1638

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy J. Nelson whose telephone number is (703) 306-3218. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Paula Hutzell, can be reached at (703) 308-4310. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application, or if the examiner cannot be reached as indicated above, should be directed to the legal analyst, Yolanda Vines, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2365.



**AMY J. NELSON, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Amy J. Nelson, Ph.D.

June 10, 2001